

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STANDARD FOR RECONSIDERATION	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. The Order’s Mention of Payment of Termination Fees by the “ <i>New Owners</i> ” Rather than the “ <i>Former Owners</i> ” Is Not Controversial or Significant	3
B. The KG Defendants’ Argument that Japan Law Applies, and that the Court Misapplied it, is Wrong	4
1. Hawai’i Choice of Law Rules Require Application of Hawai’i Law in Determining the Applicability of the KG Defendants’ Defenses to the SS Companies’ Hawai’i Law Claims	7
2. Hawai’i’s Choice of Law Analysis Dictates that Hawai’i Law Applies Here	8
3. The KG Defendants Fail to Show that Japan Courts Would Apply Japan Law	10
4. Even Assuming Japan Law Applies, Mr. Kosugi’s Opinion is Deficient and Wrong	10
C. The Court Correctly Applied U.S. Law in Determining That the <i>in Pari Delicto</i> /imputation Defenses Do Not Apply to the SS Plaintiffs	14
1. The KG Defendants’ Legal Arguments are Wrong and Belated	14
2. <i>Scholes</i> and <i>O’Melveny</i> Clearly Apply and Support the Result	18
D. Factual and Legal Issues Remain Regarding Toshio Kinoshita’s Control and Ownership of the SS Companies	20

Page

E. The Sole Actor Rule Does Not Apply as a Matter of Law 21

F. The KG Defendants’ Voluntarily Admitted the Allegations in the
Complaint, Including Those Regarding Intercompany Debt, in this
Case 23

G. Toshio Was “Secretly Acting Adversely” to the SS Companies and
His Knowledge May Not Be Imputed to Them 23

H. The Order Correctly States That the STP Is Not Part of the Transfer
That Plaintiffs Are Challenging in this Case 25

I. Defendants’ FRCP 56(d) Request is Improper 27

IV. CONCLUSION 28